

Serial No. 10/700,310

Docket No. NG(ST)6564

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTERREMARKS

JUN 06 2007

Claims 1-48 are currently pending in the subject application, and are presently under consideration. Claims 1-17, 26-30, 34, 35, 38-42 and 44-46 are rejected. Claims 18-25, 31-33, 36, 37, 43, 47 and 48 have been indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 1 has been amended to include subject matter from claim 37. Claim 12 has been rewritten to include the subject matter of claim 19. Claim 28 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 31. Claim 34 has been amended to include the subject matter of claims 35 and 36. Claim 38 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 43. Claim 44 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 47. Claims 32 and 48 have been amended to maintain consistent dependency in light of the other amendments. Claims 19, 31, 35, 36, 43, and 47 have been cancelled. Favorable reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the amendments and comments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 28, 29 and 34 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 28, 29 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,184,490 B1 to Rybicki, et al. ("Rybicki"). Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 37, which was indicated to include subject matter that is patentable over Rybicki. Claim 28 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 31, which was indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 34 has been amended to include the subject matter of claims 35 and 36, as claim 36 was indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 29 depends from claim 28 and is allowable for at least the same reason. It is thus submitted that claims 1, 28, 29, and 34 define patentable invention over the cited art, and the withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claims 12, 13, 15 and 16 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 12, 13, 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,664,921 B2 to Pratt ("Pratt"). Claim 12 has been amended to include the

Serial No. 10/700,310

Docket No. NG(ST)6564

subject matter of claim 19 which has been indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 13, 15, and 16 depend from claim 12 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. It is thus respectfully submitted that claims 12, 13, 15 and 16 should be patentable over the cited art. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 28, 30, 38 and 39 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 28, 30, 38 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,013,166 B2 to Clifford ("Clifford"). Claim 28 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 31, which has been indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 38 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 43, which has been indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 30 and 39 depend from claims 28 and 38, respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons. It is thus respectfully submitted that claims 28, 30, 38 and 39 should be patentable over the cited art. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claim 44 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claim 44 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2004/0041945 A1 to Pugel, et al. ("Pugel"). Claim 44 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 47, which has been indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form. It is thus respectfully submitted that claim 44 should be patentable over the cited art. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

V. Rejection of Claims 2 and 4-7 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 2 and 4-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rybicki in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,081,515 to Toivola ("Toivola"). Claims 2 and 4-7 each depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1, which contains subject matter that has been indicated as allowable. Claims 2 and 4-7 should thus be allowable for at least the same reasons.

Serial No. 10/700,310

Docket No. NG(ST)6564

It is thus respectfully submitted that claims 2 and 4-7 should be patentable over the cited art, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VI. Rejection of Claim 8 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rybicki in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0171674 A1 to Jago, et al. ("Jago"). Claim 8 depends from claim 1, which contains subject matter that has been indicated as allowable. Claim 8 should thus be allowable for at least the same reasons. It is thus respectfully submitted that claim 8 should be patentable over the cited art, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VII. Rejection of Claim 9 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rybicki in view of Pratt. Claim 9 depends from claim 1, which contains subject matter that has been indicated as allowable. Claim 9 should thus be allowable for at least the same reasons. It is thus respectfully submitted that claim 9 should be patentable over the cited art, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VIII. Rejection of Claims 10 and 11 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rybicki in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,805,983 to Naidu, et al. ("Naidu"). Claims 10 and 11 each depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1, which contains subject matter that has been indicated as allowable. Claims 10 and 11 should thus be allowable for at least the same reasons. It is thus respectfully submitted that claims 10 and 11 should be patentable over the cited art, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Serial No. 10/700,310

Docket No. NG(ST)6564

IX. Rejection of Claim 14 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pratt in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,408,690 to Ishikawa, et al. ("Ishikawa"). Claim 14 depends from claim 12, which contains subject matter that has been indicated as allowable. Claim 14 should thus be allowable for at least the same reasons. It is thus respectfully submitted that claim 14 should be patentable over the cited art, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

X. Rejection of Claim 17 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pratt in view of Pugel. Claim 17 depends from claim 12, which contains subject matter that has been indicated as allowable. Claim 17 should thus be allowable for at least the same reasons. It is thus respectfully submitted that claim 17 should be patentable over the cited art, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

XI. Rejection of Claims 26 and 27 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 26 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pratt in view of Naidu. Claims 26 and 27 each depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 12, which contains subject matter that has been indicated as allowable. Claims 26 and 27 should thus be allowable for at least the same reasons. It is thus respectfully submitted that claims 26 and 27 should be patentable over the cited art, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

XII. Rejection of Claim 35 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 35 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rybicki in view of Toivola. Claim 35 has been cancelled.

Serial No. 10/700,310

Docket No. NG(ST)6564

XIII. Rejection of Claim 40 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 40 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Clifford in view of Pratt. Claim 40 depends from claim 38, which contains subject matter that has been indicated as allowable. Claim 40 should thus be allowable for at least the same reasons. It is thus respectfully submitted that claim 40 should be patentable over the cited art, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

XIV. Rejection of Claims 41 and 42 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 41 and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Clifford in view of Pugel. Claims 41 and 42 each depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 38, which contains subject matter that has been indicated as allowable. Claims 41 and 42 should thus be allowable for at least the same reasons. It is thus respectfully submitted that claims 41 and 42 should be patentable over the cited art, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

XV. Rejection of Claims 45 and 46 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 45 and 46 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pugel in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,914,437 B2 to Ibrahim, et al. ("Ibrahim"). Claims 45 and 46 each depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 44, which contains subject matter that has been indicated as allowable. Claims 45 and 46 should thus be allowable for at least the same reasons. It is thus respectfully submitted that claims 45 and 46 should be patentable over the cited art, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

XVI. Rejection of Claim 3 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rybicki in view of Toivola as applied to claim 2, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,291,924 B1 to Lau, et al. ("Lau"). Claim 3 depends indirectly from claim 1, which contains subject matter that

Best Available Copy

JUN-06-2007 15:26 FROM 2166214072

TO PTO CENTRAL FAX

P.16

Serial No. 10/700,310

Docket No. NG(ST)6564

has been indicated as allowable. Claim 3 should thus be allowable for at least the same reasons. It is thus respectfully submitted that claim 3 should be patentable over the cited art, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Best Available Copy

JUN-06-2007 15:26 FROM 2166214072

TO PTO CENTRAL FAX

P.17

Serial No. 10/700,310

Docket No. NG(ST)6564

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

CONCLUSION

JUN 06 2007

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and that the application be passed to issue.

Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment in the fees for this amendment to our Deposit Account No. 20-0090.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

5/6/07


Christopher P. Harris
Registration No. 43,660

CUSTOMER NO.: 26,294

TAROLLI, SUNDHEIM, COVELL, & TUMMINO L.L.P.
1300 EAST NINTH STREET, SUITE 1700
CLEVELAND, OHIO 44114
Phone: (216) 621-2234
Fax: (216) 621-4072

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- BLACK BORDERS**
- IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.